# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/605,422	09/30/2003	Hui-Jan Chien		ACMP0129USA	2421	
27765 7590 06/15/2007 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506				EXAMINER		
				KASSA, YOSEF		
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116					PAPER NUMBER	
			•	2624		
		•			•	
			. [	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			•	06/15/2007	ELECTRONIC	

### Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/605,422	CHIEN, HUI-JAN
		Examiner	Art Unit
		YOSEF KASSA	2624
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE OF THE OF THE MAILING DATE OF THE OF THE OF THE OF THE OF THE OF	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for a cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			·
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 Ap</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicati	on Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is a	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority L	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		· .
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been recei ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage
Attachmen	t(s)	•	
1)  Notic 2)  Notic 3)  Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 2624

# FINAL ACTION Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment/argument filed on April 19, 2007 has been entered and made of record. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's argues that on page 4-5 of the remarks, that Damera-Venkata does not disclose computing processed colorimetric channels X and Z based on the processed luminance channel Y. The Examiner disagrees. Please refer to Damera-Venkata Fig. 2, items 103 and 104 and 107, which broadly teaches that the output color value in CMYK space computed based on the extracted luminance component Y value, also refer to col. 6, lines 1-5, shows that output color dot 106 computed using 205 (output color value) based on the output value of item 204 (luminance value refer to Fig. 3) for allowed output color values. Therefore, Damera-Venkata clearly meet all the claimed invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/605,422

Art Unit: 2624

Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damera-Venkata (U.S. Patent 6,920,243), and further in view of Buhr et al (U.S. Patent 6,791,716).

With regard to claim 1, Damera-Venkata discloses performing a transformation process to transform an original image signal into CIE XYZ colorimetric channels (please refer col. 5, lines 30-34);

forming a luminance channel Y (refer col. 5, lines 35-45);

applying a filter on the luminance channel Y to obtain a processed luminance channel Y" (refer col. 5, lines 35-45);

computing processed colorimetric channels X" and Z" based on the processed luminance channel Y" (refer col. 5, lines 36-44); and

performing an inverse transformation process to transform the processed colorimetric channels X"Y"Z" into a processed image signal (refer col. 5, lines 55-59).

Damera-Venkata does not disclose expressly for increase sharpness of the image without changing hue characteristics. However, at the same field of endeavor, Buhr discloses this feature (please refer to col. 5, lines 50-65, that is, controlling hue process). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching Buhr image reproducing process into Damera-Venkata system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide producing the visual reproduction to meet both the hue and color enhancement process (please refer to col. 6, lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Buhr with Damera-Venkata to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Application/Control Number: 10/605,422

Art Unit: 2624

With regard to claim 4, Damera-Venkata discloses (a) the transformation process comprises transforming RGB values of the original image signal into CIE XYZ colorimetric channels (refer col. 5, lines 30-38).

With regard to claim 5, Damera-Venkata discloses step (e) the inverse transformation process comprises transforming the processed colorimetric channels X"Y"Z" into R"G"B" values of the processed image signal (refer col. 5, lines 54-59).

With regard to claim 6, Damera-Venkata discloses (a) the transfor-mation process comprises transforming CMYK values of the original image signal into CIE XYZ colorimetric channels (refer col. 6, lines 5-12).

With regard to claim 7, Damera-Venkata discloses (e) the inverse transformation process comprises transforming the processed colorimetric channels X"Y"Z" into C"M"Y"K" values of the processed image signal (refer col. 6, lines 1-6).

With regard to claim 10, Damera-Venkata discloses an image processing apparatus (refer col. 5, lines 1-8).

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damera-Venkata (U.S. Patent 6,920,243) and Buhr et al (U.S. Patent 6,791,716), and further in view of Matama (U.S. Patent 6,603,886).

With regard to claim 2, Damera-Venkata and Buhr are silent about the filter applied in step (c) is an unsharp masking (USM) filter. However, at the same field of endeavor, Matama discloses this feature (please refer to refer col. 6, lines 60-65). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching Matama's image sharping process into Damera-Venkata

Art Unit: 2624

and Buhr system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide representing unsharp mask image for shutting light processing (please refer to col. 6, lines 55-65 or Matama).

With regard to claim 3, Damera-Venkata is silent about the filter applied in step (c) is a sharpness filter. However, at the same field of endeavor, Matama discloses this feature (please refer to refer col. 6, lines 60-65). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching Matama's image sharping process into Damera-Venkata and Buhr system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide representing unsharp mask image for shutting light processing (please refer to col. 6, lines 55-65 or Matama).

#### Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (571) 272-7452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communication and (571) 273-8300 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

#### **PATENT EXAMINER**

Yosef Kassa

06/08/2007.